



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,597	09/29/2000	Eric James	99EC036/77527	9867
24628	7590	12/28/2007		
WELSH & KATZ, LTD	EXAMINER			
120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA	PHAN, JOSEPH T			
22ND FLOOR				
CHICAGO, IL 60606	ART UNIT			
	2614			
	PAPER NUMBER			
	MAIL DATE			
	12/28/2007			
	DELIVERY MODE			
	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/675,597	JAMES ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Joseph T. Phan	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Aug 08/2007
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Partovi et al., Patent #6,970,915 in view of Foladare, et al., EP 0903921 A2.**

Regarding claim 1, Partovi teaches a method of using voice to access call center information in a call center comprising the steps of: connecting an administrator of the call center to a voice response server(*col.4 lines 26-40 and col.15 lines 6-17; caller of voice portal/call center is an administrator since the caller is able to administer what is played to the user*); the voice response server processing voice telephone requests from the administrator for information about the call center(*500 Fig.5 and col.7 lines 5-30*), and the voice response server responding to the telephone requests by providing information about the call center to the administrator(*512 of Fig.5, col.5 lines 15-30, and col.15 lines 30-45*)

Partovi does not expressly disclose that his users are administrators responsible for management of the call center.

Foladare teaches administrators(CSR's) responsible for management of a call center(*col.1 line 56-col.2 line 9 and col.2 lines 25-33; having call control commands is part of managing*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have CSR's that are responsible for management as taught by Foladare included as the users in Partovi.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this as both Partovi and Foladare are in the same field of endeavor and allowing Foladare's administrators to access and manage call center functions would enable more flexibility and increase moral among administrators.

Regarding claim 2, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of connecting further comprises the step of interfacing with a telephony server to receive telephony input from a remote administrator(col.13 lines 22-28 and col.13 line 63-col.14 line 10).

Regarding claim 3, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of connecting to a voice response server further comprises the step of authenticating users of the voice response server(col.5 lines 25-39).

Regarding claim 4, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 3 wherein the step of authenticating is performed by matching login names with passwords(col.13 line 63-col.14 line 10).

Regarding claim 5, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing further comprises translating an administrator's input into a command recognized by a computer in the call center(col.5 lines 15-50)

Regarding claim 6, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 5 wherein the computer includes an automatic call distributor(200 Fig.2) and call center command server(110 or 160 Fig.2).

Regarding claim 7, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing adheres to the VoicexML standard processing further comprises the step of using speech recognition to translate an administrator's input into a command recognized by a computer in the call center(col.11 lines 6-16 and lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 8, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of responding further comprises the step of performing text to speech translation to aurally present information to administrators(col.11 lines 17-27).

Regarding claim 9, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing adheres to VoicexML(col.11 lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 10, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing employs learning a pattern of regularly used accessed commands of a respective administrator to automatically provide information to the administrator(col.5 lines 15-25).

Regarding claim 11, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of processing is interrupted by a barge in request(col.7 lines 6-12; bookmark it or shortcut this is barge in request).

Regarding claim 12, Partovi teaches a system for using voice to access call center information in a call center comprising:
means for connecting an administrator of the call center to a voice response server(*Fig.2, col.4 lines 12-40 and col.15 lines 6-17*);
means for processing telephone requests from the administrator for information about the call center(*Fig.2, 500 Fig.5 and col.7 lines 5-30*), and means for responding to the voice telephone requests by providing information about the call center to the administrator(*512 of Fig.5, col.5 lines 15-30, and col.15 lines 30-45*).

Partovi does not expressly disclose that his users are administrators responsible for management of the call center.

Foladare teaches administrators(CSR's) responsible for management of a call center(col.1 line 56-col.2 line 9 and col.2 lines 25-33; having call control commands is part of managing).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have CSR's that are responsible for management as taught by Foladare included as the users in Partovi.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this as both Partovi and Foladare are in the same field of endeavor and allowing Foladare's administrators to access and manage call center functions would enable more flexibility and increase moral among administrators.

Regarding claim 13, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 12 wherein the means for connecting includes a programmable computer configured to accept telephony requests(fig.2).

Regarding claim 14, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 12 wherein the means for processing includes a voice response server comprising a programmable computer(Fig.2).

Regarding claim 15, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 12 wherein the means for responding includes a programmable computer(Fig.2)

Regarding claim 16, Partovi teaches a system for using voice to access call center information in a call center comprising;

a call manager which accepts information requests by voice from an administrator of the call center and which provides information about the call center(*200 Fig. 2, col.4 lines 12-40 and col.15 lines 6-17*);

a VXML interpreter that translates information between-the administrator and call center, and a network interface that manages transmission and receipt of data between the VXML interpreter and call center(*col.11 lines 53-60, 512 of Fig.5, col.5 lines 15-30, and col.15 lines 30-45*).

Partovi does not expressly disclose that his users are administrators responsible for management of the call center.

Foladare teaches administrators(CSR's) responsible for management of a call center(*col.1 line 56-col.2 line 9 and col.2 lines 25-33; having call control commands is part of managing*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have CSR's that are responsible for management as taught by Foladare included as the users in Partovi.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this as both Partovi and Foladare are in the same field of endeavor and allowing Foladare's administrators to access and manage call center functions would enable more flexibility and increase moral among administrators.

Regarding claim 17, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 16 wherein the call manager is a programmable computer which interfaces to a telephony

server to receive telephone input from a remote administrator(col.13 lines 22-28 and col.13 line 63-col.14 line 10).

Regarding claim 18, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the call manager further comprises a telephony interface for receiving telephony input from a remote administrator(col.5 lines 25-39).

Regarding claim 19, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the call manager includes a database for authenticating users of the system(col.13 line 63-col.14 line 10).

Regarding claim 20, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the call manager includes a translator for performing speech to text conversion(col.7 lines 5-12 and col.11 lines 6-26).

Regarding claim 21, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the VoicexML interpreter includes a programmable computer 'for translating telephony requests to VoicexML commands(col.11 lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 22, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the VoicexML interpreter includes a translator for rendering VoicexML commands into automatic call distributor commands(col.11 lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 23, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the call manager interrupts information requesting presentations in response to a barge in request from the administrator(col.11 lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 24, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the network interface includes local area network, Internet, extranet, and wireless network software(fig.1).

Regarding claim 25, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the network interface includes a programmable computer for translating VoicexML commands into data packets for a local area network(fig.1 and col.11 lines 53-60).

Regarding claim 26, Partovi in view of Foladare teaches the system of claim 17 wherein the network interface includes computer hardware which retrieves data from a local area network and translates the data into VoicexML commands(fig.1 and col.11 lines 53-60).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph T. Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7544. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JTP
December 22, 2007

RNP Sb 12-26-07
Primary Examiner
AU 2614